



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/672,636	09/28/2000	Gary Dan Dotson	00AB151	8215

7590 10/21/2003

Allen-Bradley Company Inc
John J Horn
Patent Dept 704P Floor 8 T 29
1201 South Second Street
Milwaukee, WI 53204

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, KIMNHUNG T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2674

DATE MAILED: 10/21/2003

7

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/672,636

Applicant(s)

DOTSON, GARY DAN

Examiner

Kimmhung Nguyen

Art Unit

2674

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 July 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

This application has been examined. The claims 1-29 are pending. The examination results are as following.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1, 15 and 29 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Schaffstein et al. (US patent 6,140,994).

Schaffstein et al. disclose in figures 1 and 3 that a video controller for interfacing a frame buffer (26) to a display in a computer system comprising a raster engine (see Raster Operator code 80 and display screen 30) comprising a raster engine adapted to receive video data from the frame buffer (30) to format the video data and to render the formatted data to the display (see figure 1); and a hardware blink logic system (because the system having logical AND and ORed, see abstract) operatively associated with the raster engine to selectively blink at least one pixel (32) on the display on the display (see figure 1, see abstract, see column 3, lines 48-50).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 2-6, 8-9, 11-13, 16-20 and 22-24 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schaffstein et al. and in view of Fleming et al. (US patent 4,439,759).

Schaffstein et al. disclose the video controller for interfacing a frame buffer to a display in a computer system having a raster engine and a hardware blink logic system having at least one pixel on the display as discussed in claims 1, 15 and 29 above, furthermore, Schaffstein et al. disclose a programmable via the computer system (see column 1, lines 28-29, column 5, lines 38-39). However, Schaffstein et al. do not disclose a blink mode in the video controller. Fleming et al. disclose a set color mode to 0 or to 1 to the display system with blink color, that is the blink mode (see figure 4, column 6, lines 20-43). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the teachings of using the blink mode as taught by Fleming et al. in the system device of Shibata et al. and Schaffstein et al. because this would select a particular mode of color memory access and provide for accessing data in a terminal independent manner.

5. Claims 25-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Art Unit: 2674

Schaffstein et al. (US patent 6,140,994) in view of Fleming et al. (US patent 4,439,759) as applied to claims 1 and 15 above, and further in view of Wakeland et al. (US patent 5,258,826).

Schaffstein et al. and Fleming et al. disclose the video controller for interfacing a frame buffer to a display in a computer system having a raster engine and a hardware blink logic system having at least one pixel on the display as discussed in claims 1, 15 and 29 above. However, Schaffstein et al. and Fleming et al. do not disclose a system comprising a blink to offset color 888 modes. Wakeland et al. disclose the conversion multiple RGB mode, including 888 modes into eight bit red, green and blue components (see abstract). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the teachings of using 888 mode into eight bit red, green and blue components as taught by Wakeland et al. into the display system of Schaffstein et al. and Fleming et al. because this would for selection of which is controlled by the content of an 8 bit hidden (see column 6, lines 47-61).

6. Claims 7, 14, 21 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schaffstein et al. (US patent 6,140,994) as applied to claims 1 and 15 above, and further in view of Wise (US patent 6,326,999).

Schaffstein et al. disclose the video controller for interfacing a frame buffer to a display in a computer system having a raster engine and a hardware blink logic system having at least one pixel on the display as discussed above. However, they do not disclose a blink rate register operatively into the display system. Wise discloses a method for converting frames of data received at a slower rate into fields of data

generated at a faster rate (see column 2, lines 61-63). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the teachings of using the method data converting frames of data received at a slower rate into fields of data generated at a faster rate (blink rate) as taught by Wise into the display system of Schaffstein et al. because this would for calculating a differential of the field repletion rate from the difference between the ration of the faster to slower rates and the ratio of the basic repetition number of fields in the frame period to the slower frame rate (see column 2, lines 66-67 and column 3,lines 1-2).

7. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schaffstein et al. (US patent 6,140,994) and in view of Fleming et al. (US patent 4,439,759) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Shibata et al. (US patent 4,845,477).

Schaffstein et al. and Fleming et al. disclose a video controller for frame buffer to a display in a computer system as discussed above. However, Schaffstein et al. and Fleming et al. do not disclose a logical exclusive OR operation on formatted data associated with the at least one blinking pixel. Shibata et al. disclose an apparatus and method for color blink in a color display system having an exclusive OR (see column 4, lines 10-11). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the teachings of using a logical exclusive OR as taught by Shibata et al. is adapted into the display system having at least one blinking pixel of Schaffstein et al. and Fleming et al. because this would for generating the color select signal.

Response to Amendment

8. Applicant's argument filed on 2-20-03 has been fully considered but they are not persuasive in view of new ground rejection.

Applicant argues that Shibata et al. do not teach a hardware blink logic system capable of selectively blinking at least one pixel on a display. However, this argument is not persuasive due to the teachings of Schaffstein et al. as disclose above.

Correspondence

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kimnhung Nguyen whose telephone number (703) 308-0425.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **RICHARD A HJERPE** can be reached on (703) 305-4709.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D. C. 20231

Or faxed to:

(703) 872-9314 (for Technology Center 2600 only).

Hand-delivery response should be brought to: Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive,
Arlington, VA Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Art Unit: 2674

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.

Kimnhung Nguyen
October 11, 2003



RICHARD HJERPE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600